

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 079 379

TM 002 978

AUTHOR Bass, Bernard M.; And Others  
TITLE Standardized Magnitude Estimations of Frequency and Amount for Use in Rating Extensivity.  
INSTITUTION Rochester Univ., N. Y. Management Research Center.  
SPONS AGENCY Office of Naval Research, Washington, D.C. Personnel and Training Research Programs Office.  
REPORT NO TR-61  
PUB DATE 1 Apr 73  
NOTE 27p.  
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29  
DESCRIPTORS Language Research; \*Language Usage; Linguistic Patterns; \*Rating Scales; \*Statistical Analysis; Technical Reports; \*Word Frequency

ABSTRACT

Magnitude estimation was employed to find the numerical equivalents of 39 expressions of frequency ranging from never to always, and 44 expressions of amount ranging from none to all. The results were generalizable across three age-education-occupation levels and unaffected by whether ratings were an important or unimportant issue. Geometric means and appropriate variance measures are provided for each expression as well as suggestions for four- through nine-point scale anchors. The percent overlap in judgments for adjacent points on scales are also given. Results are related to earlier work on scaling, and the utility of the present approach is indicated. (Author)

ED 079379

TM 002 978

Graduate School of Management  
Management Research Center

University  
of  
Rochester



ED 079379

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH  
EDUCATION & WELFARE  
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF  
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Technical Report 61

Standardized Magnitude Estimations  
of Frequency and  
Amount for Use in Rating Extensivity

B. M. Bass  
W. F. Cascio  
E. J. O'Connor

Management Research Center  
University of Rochester

This research was sponsored by the Personnel and Training Research Programs, Psychological Sciences Division, Office of Naval Research, under Contract No. N00014-67-A-0398-0015, NR 151-351.

Approved for public release, distribution unlimited. Reproduction in whole or in part is permitted for any purpose of the United States Government.

April 1, 1973

## DOCUMENT CONTROL DATA - R &amp; D

Management Research Center  
The University of Rochester  
Rochester, New York 14627

Unclassified

Standardized Magnitude Estimations of Frequency and Amount for Use  
in Rating Extensivity

Technical Report 61

Bernard M. Bass, Wayne F. Cascio, Edward J. O'Connor

April 1, 1973

25

16

N00014-67-A-0398-0015

NR 151-351

Technical Report 61

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

Personnel & Training Research Programs  
Psychological Services Division  
Office of Naval Research

Magnitude estimation was employed to find the numerical equivalents of 39 expressions of frequency ranging from never to always, and 44 expressions of amount ranging from none to all. The results were generalizable across three age-education-occupation levels and unaffected by whether ratings were an important or unimportant issue.

Geometric means and appropriate variance measures are provided for each expression as well as suggestions for four through nine-point scale anchors. The percent overlap in judgments for adjacent points on scales are also given. Results are related to earlier work on scaling, and the utility of the present approach is indicated.

Sheppard (1954) determined for 78 British subjects the mean distance on a 7 inch line represented by the phrases and adverbs, very bad, bad, rather bad, and so forth. Results were as follows:

	<u>Inches</u>	
	<u>Mean</u>	<u>S.D.</u>
Very bad	6.3	.32
Bad	5.5	.44
Rather bad	4.9	.70
Not very bad	3.9	.58
Average	3.4	.29
Not very good	3.4	.57
Rather good	2.3	.47
Good	1.7	.67
Very good	0.8	.27

Much more comprehensively, Cliff (1959) looked at adverbs such as slightly, somewhat, rather, very, etc. as modifiers of a variety of adjectives such as evil, immoral, nice, lovable, etc. Reliability of paired comparison judgments was found to be .999. The multiplying values of "intensity" of each adverb for three college student samples from Wayne, Princeton, and Dartmouth, are shown in Table 2. The stability across the three samples is striking evidence of the relative invariance of such adverb modifiers.

-----  
 Insert Table 2 about here  
 -----

STANDARDIZED MAGNITUDE ESTIMATIONS OF  
FREQUENCY AND AMOUNT FOR USE IN RATING EXTENSIVITY

Bernard M. Bass, Wayne F. Cascio, and Edward J. O'Connor  
Management Research Center  
University of Rochester

Introduction

Extensivity in English is a matter of frequency or amount. A limited number of adverbial and adjectival modifiers are available for expressing the range of extensivity in frequency (never to always) and amount (none to all). The extent or degree to which a behavior has been observed, a sensation felt, or an idea experienced can be expressed by one set of modifiers concerning the frequency of occurrence of the observation, sensation or experience. Or their range can be encompassed by another set concerning the amount of the occurrence. Many other aspects of the behavior, sensation, or experience can be described such as their goodness, strength, and potency (Osgood, Suci, & Tannenbaum, 1957). But these can always be expressed in terms of frequency and amount. Thus, a scale evaluating "goodness" can be couched in terms of frequencies of occurrence such as "usually good" or "rarely good" or in terms of amounts of occurrence such as "fairly good" or "very good."

Following Fechner's logarithmic law of the relation between stimulus and sensation, Thurstone (1927) introduced subjective scaling procedures for equal-interval scaling. Quantitative values were assigned to observed behavior, attitudinal statements, sensations, or experiences in the hope of achieving scales of equal intervals with an arbitrary zero. For purposes of merit rating, for instance, this procedure made possible the identification of the scale weights of 724 statements about the performance of any job occupant. These median weights were relatively invariant to the particular sample of judges employed to establish the weights (Uhrbrock,

1950). At about the same time, Hemphill and Coons (undated), in developing the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ), identified 42 adverbs of frequency or extent. A small group of their staff completed paired comparisons among these against the criterion of how much each expressed frequency or extent. The modal rank reached by each adverb was noted. In any pairing with other adverbs, "always" for example was always judged greater of the pair in how much it expressed frequency or extent. "Never" was always of lesser extent in pairings with other adverbs.

Some years earlier, Simpson (1944) had asked 335 high school and college students to indicate the "number of times in a 100" signified by each of 20 adverbs and adverb phrases. They were asked to give a range of estimates for each answer. The midpoint of each respondent's range was tabulated and the median of these midpoints was published as shown in Table 1.

-----  
 Insert Table 1 about here  
 -----

Hakel (1958) repeated Simpson's work with 100 Minnesota students. He noted a high degree of agreement between the medians of Simpson's and his samples, as well as large individual differences in response to many of the adverbs. Nevertheless, such individual differences varied considerably from one adverb to the next. For example, the interquartile range found by Hakel for "always" was only 2 (times in 100) varying from  $Q_1$  of 98 to  $Q_3$  of 100. It was only 7 for "frequently," and a remarkably invariant 0 for "about as often as not." For this phrase,  $Q_1$ ,  $Q_2$ , and  $Q_3$  were all 50. All the adverbs implying low frequency such as "seldom," "rarely," and "never" also had low interquartile ranges.

Sheppard (1954) determined for 78 British subjects the mean distance on a 7 inch line represented by the phrases and adverbs, very bad, bad, rather bad, and so forth. Results were as follows:

	<u>Inches</u>	
	<u>Mean</u>	<u>S.D.</u>
Very bad	6.3	.32
Bad	5.5	.44
Rather bad	4.9	.70
Not very bad	3.9	.58
Average	3.4	.29
Not very good	3.4	.57
Rather good	2.3	.47
Good	1.7	.67
Very good	0.8	.27

Much more comprehensively, Cliff (1959) looked at adverbs such as slightly, somewhat, rather, very, etc. as modifiers of a variety of adjectives such as evil, immoral, nice, lovable, etc. Reliability of paired comparison judgments was found to be .999. The multiplying values of "intensity" of each adverb for three college student samples from Wayne, Princeton, and Dartmouth, are shown in Table 2. The stability across the three samples is striking evidence of the relative invariance of such adverb modifiers.

-----  
 Insert Table 2 about here  
 -----



Cliff's success with a multiplicative model for adverbs of intensity argues strongly for both the theoretical as well as practical utility of a multiplicative rather than an additive approach to adverbs as modifiers of frequency and amount, such as employed by Hemphill & Coon, Simpson, Sheppard, and Hakel. As a consequence, magnitude estimations using Stevens' procedures (1966) seemed to be a more accurate way of standardizing expressions of frequency and amount, a way which better fitted the true nature of relations between stimulus and subjective experience. Such standardization, if sufficiently invariant for pools of different individuals, could then be used by any investigators desirous of building any kind of behavioral rating scales where objective quantities of frequency and amount could readily be associated with subjective modifiers according to Stevens' law (1971) that equal stimulus ratios produce equal sensations.

Bass (1968) initiated such an effort for a questionnaire survey. The frequency scale he used was based on a magnitude estimation study of 28 adverbs of frequency. Each of 71 undergraduate students had been asked to assign a number of his own choosing to "sometimes," then to indicate what number would best fit each of the 28 other adverbs. On the average, in relation to "sometimes," "always" was seen as 2.533 times as frequent; "very often" was 2.093 times as frequent; "fairly often" was 1.683 times as frequent. Thus, these particular six adverbs of the 28 studied bore an approximate relation to each other of 5:4:3:2:1:0 and were selected as the response alternatives for a questionnaire.

#### Purpose

The purpose of the present investigation was to obtain reliably established geometric means and standard deviations of magnitude

estimations of reasonably exhaustive lists of expressions of frequency and amount used to modify attitudinal ratings. Also, we set out to see if such results were insensitive to ratings of important, as opposed to unimportant, issues for the raters. It was hypothesized that judges would generate one set of ratios of extensivity when rating issues of consequence to them and a different set when judging issues of little importance to them. Only if the hypothesis was rejected would a single standardized list be possible.

#### METHOD

The method employed was that of ratio scaling. Ratio scaling uses magnitude estimation (Stevens, 1966, 1971), in which any value is assigned to a referent concept and then all other stimuli are judged in relation to the referent concept. For example, if an individual attaches the value "30" to the word "sometimes" he might assign "15" to the word "seldom" if he felt seldom represented one half as much as sometimes. Likewise he might assign the value "300" to the word "always" if he felt that "always" expressed 10 times as much as the word sometimes.

#### Subjects

A total of 175 male and female Ss scaled 39 expressions of frequency and 44 expressions of quantity. The expressions appeared in one of five different orders so as to guard against any such order effects. Subjects were drawn from three populations: night school MBA students (most of whom were working), adult undergraduate students, and high school juniors.

#### Importance Versus Unimportance

The purpose of the present investigation was to scale expressions of frequency (how often) and quantity (how much). Accordingly Ss were randomly assigned to

one of two conditions:

- Condition 1: expressions of frequency - important topic  
expressions of quantity - unimportant topic
- Condition 2: expressions of quantity - important topic  
expressions of frequency - unimportant topic

To ensure agreement with what E's considered topics of importance (air pollution and the Viet Nam war) and unimportance (the amount of rainfall in Nepal, worms in the street after a rain storm), we asked Ss to rate each topic on a five-point Likert scale of importance from "extremely important to me" to "extremely unimportant to me." To make more meaningful experimental comparisons, each S's data was analyzed only if a particular topic was ranked either in the top or bottom third of the distribution of importance-unimportance for that topic. Ss who ranked topics in the mid-range of importance-unimportance were deleted from the analysis. This left 134 Ss in the analysis of expressions of frequency (22 MBA students, 37 high school students, and 75 college students) and 130 Ss in the analysis of expressions of quantity (23 MBA students, 34 high school students, and 83 college students).

## RESULTS

Results pertinent to the central hypothesis of the study are presented in Tables 3 and 4. These analyses were performed (as suggested by Stevens, 1966, 1971) on the logarithms of the raw data. Table 3 presents the means and standard deviations (antilog values) of the 39 expressions of frequency for the total sample. The multivariate  $F$  of 1.55 was not statistically significant, nor were any of the univariate  $F$ s. When the untransformed raw data was analyzed, the multivariate  $F$  of 1.79 was statistically significant, as were univariate  $F$ s for the words "rather seldom," "frequently if not

always," "very seldom," and "a great many times." The data was then transformed in two ways. Because different Ss might have chosen different anchor values for the referent concepts (e.g. one S might assign the value 10 to "sometimes" while to another "sometimes" might mean 100) the data was statistically transformed so that each person's anchor value was the same, namely, 50. To do this, each subject's original anchor value was divided into 50 and all other values multiplied by the result. The second transformation involved the use of logarithms of the raw data.

Both transformations yielded identical results. Neither the multivariate  $F$  of 1.55 nor any of the univariate  $F$ s was significant when the scale values were compared across important and unimportant contexts.

The log-transformed data were then analyzed by population. Again there were no significant differences in the mean scale values assigned to expressions of frequency when these expressions were imbedded in important, as opposed to unimportant contexts. This conclusion was the same for the MBA's, college students, and high school students that constituted our sample.

In Table 4 are presented the means and standard deviations (antilog values) of the 24 expressions of quantity for the total sample. Neither the multivariate  $F$  of 0.84, nor any of the univariate  $F$ s were statistically significant. Again this analysis was performed on the logarithms of the raw data. In contrast to the frequency analysis, neither the multivariate  $F$  of 0.94 nor any of the univariate  $F$ s was significant in the analysis of the raw data. In addition, there were no significant differences when the data were transformed so that each S had the same anchor value. The log transformed data were then analyzed by population. Again there were no significant differences across our samples of MBA's, college students, and high school students.

Tables 5 and 6 present, respectively, 4-point through 9-point scales of expressions of frequency and quantity as well as the percentage overlap in distribution between adjacent scale points for the 4-point through 9-point scales of expressions of frequency and quantity. The expressions chosen to represent the various points on each scale are statistically optimal in the sense that their mean scale values came closest to the exact mathematical values necessary to establish a scale of any given ratio, and the observed variances about their respective means were small. The means and standard deviations of all the expressions have been presented in Tables 3 and 4 in the hope that the complete lists can more adequately suit the particular needs of the individual investigator.

Tilton's overlap statistic,  $O$ , (Tilton, 1937) was computed in order to provide an index of the amount of separation present between adjacent scale points. According to Dunnette (1966) values of  $O$  can be regarded as theoretical values approximating the percentage overlaps to be expected when the same instrument is used in future situations with similarly constituted groups.

It is clear from an examination of Tables 5 and 6 that as scale fineness increases, (that is, as the number of scale points increases) so does the percentage overlap between the distribution of adjacent scale points. As the scale becomes more coarse (fewer scale points) there is correspondingly less overlap between distributions. The greatest decrease in overlap for the frequency scales appears as one moves from the 7-point to the 6-point scale. For the quantity scales this decrease appears as one moves from the 8-point to the 7-point scale. For both types of scales, however, the same relationship holds: the finer the scale, the greater the degree of overlap between the distributions of adjacent scale points.

## CONCLUSIONS

We have demonstrated, at least, for three samples of judges at different educational, and occupational levels, and for important and unimportant issues, that it is possible to fix the absolute quantitative meanings that are associated with verbal judgments of extensivity. Furthermore, we have been able to identify expressions of amount and frequency that bear integer relations with each other for 4 to 9 point scales. Also we have been able to specify the percent overlap of judgments between adjacent points on a given scale.

What we provide here are a set of invariant positive numbers beginning at zero for summarizing the increases associated with modifying expressions of frequency and amount. One interesting use of the point scales and their numerical equivalents would be to locate the verbal expression most closely matching a mean result which fell between two scale points. For example, suppose the five point scale of frequency (Table 5) had been used in a study of some substantive issue, and the mean result for a group of respondents came to 4.5, halfway between always and very often. Table 3 indicates that the expression continually (50.16) lies just about halfway between always (58.01) and very often (42.45).

The tabled results should be useful to scale developers. Scales using the expressions listed should be more comparable quantitatively. If the judgment "sometimes" is set at 19, the judgment "always" has a reliable numerical equivalent of 58 in people's minds. Many summary operations, obviously, are easier to perform using such numbers, as opposed to the words themselves, particularly if the numbers are in a ratio scale with an absolute zero.

More precision can be obtained for translations. Just how equivalent are the French "toujours", Spanish "siempre" and English "always"? For cross-language contracts, treaties and agreements, the possibility opens of using the universal language of mathematics to locate zones of disagreement between what were purported to be the same statements in different languages.

There are also implications for the use of Likert-type scales. Likert-type scales are extremely popular in industrial as well as consumer research. Such scales are often constructed of varying numbers of scale points, and employ various adjectival and/or adverbial modifiers as anchors for each scale point. Past research has focused on several properties of these scales. Investigations by Bendig (1954) and Komorita (1963) revealed that internal consistency reliability is independent of the number of scale points employed. More recently Matell and Jacoby (1971) replicated these findings and also revealed that stability, predictive validity, and concurrent validity of cumulative scores from Likert-type items were also independent of the number of scale points utilized. Most recently Matell and Jacoby (1972) demonstrated that for cumulative scores from Likert-type items, proportion of scale used was independent of the number of scale points, while mean testing time increased, and usage of the "uncertain" category decreased as the number of rating steps increased. Our work clearly shows one significant effect associated with the number of scale points used, i.e. as the number of points increases, so also the percent overlap in adjacent judgments increases. Perhaps this is another way of saying that when we move from 3 to 8 points, we pay a price for the increase in scale fineness. That is, if we don't demand seven point scales and use four point scales instead, we minimize the possibility of overlap in judgments. If we



provide say 9 points, then the overlap between adjacent point judgments can run as high as 44 per cent.

A word of caution is in order, however, before we indiscriminately abandon nine point (or finer) measuring scales. In some contexts they do have a place. For instance Ebel (1969) demonstrated that from an educational measurement standpoint the use of broad categories in grading is likely to increase the relative amount of error present in the measures on which the grades are based. This is true regardless of the degree of inaccuracy of those measures. The finer the scale used for reporting grades, i.e. the more different grade levels it provides, the more accurate the grade reports will be.

Furthermore, Ebel demonstrated that error is more often increased than diminished when grouping error is added to measurement error and the variance of the combined errors is greater than the variance of the original errors of measurement. Now since the reliability of a set of measures is determined by the relation of error variance to true score variance, the addition of grouping errors to measurement errors increases the overall error variance and therefore reduces the reliability of the scores. In general then, the fewer the categories and the more reliable the original basis for grading, the greater the loss of reliability as a result of broad categories in marking.



## REFERENCES

- Bass, B. M. How to succeed in business according to business students and managers. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1968, 52, 254-262.
- Bendig, A. W. Reliability and the number of rating scale categories. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1954, 38, 38-40.
- Cliff, N. Adverbs as multipliers. Psychological Review, 1959, 66, 27-44.
- Ebel, R. L. The relation of scale fineness to grade accuracy. Journal of Educational Measurement, 1969, 6, 217-221.
- Hakel, M. D. How often is often? Comment. American Psychologist, 1958, 23, 533-534.
- Hemphill, J. K., & Coons, A. E. Leader behavior description. Personnel Research Board, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio (undated).
- Komorita, S. S. Attitude content, intensity, and the neutral point on a Likert scale. Journal of Social Psychology, 1963, 61, 327-334.
- Matell, M. S., & Jacoby, J. Is there an optimal number of Likert scale items? Study I: Reliability and validity. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1971, 31, 657-674.
- Matell, M. S., & Jacoby, J. Is there an optimal number of alternatives for Likert-scale items? Effects of testing time and scale properties. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1972, 56, 506-509.
- Osgood, C. E., Suci, G. J., & Tannenbaum, P. H. The measurement of meaning. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1957.
- Sheppard, D. The adequacy of everyday quantitative expressions as measurements of qualities. British Journal of Psychology, 1954, 14, 40-50.

- Simpson, R. H. The specific meanings of certain terms indicating differing degrees of frequency. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1944, 30, 328-330.
- Stevens, S. S. A metric for social consensus. Science, 1966, 151, 530-541.
- Stevens, S. S. Issues in psychophysical measurement. Psychological Review, 1971, 78, 426-450.
- Thurstone, L. L. Psychophysical analysis. American Journal of Psychology, 1927, 38, 368-389.
- Uhrbrock, R. S. Standardization of 724 rating scale statements. Personnel Psychology, 1950, 2, 285-316.

Table 1

Simpson's Median Equivalents  
of Adverbs of Frequency

Term	Means this % of the time	Term	Means this % of the time
Always	99	Occasionally	20
Very often	88	Once in a while	15
Usually	85	Not often	13
Often	78	Seldom	10
Generally	78	Usually not	10
Frequently	73	Hardly ever	7
Rather often	65	Very seldom	6
About as often as not	50	Rarely	5
Sometimes	20	Almost never	3
Now and then	20	Never	0

(From Simpson, 1944, p. 328)

Table 2

Extent Adverbs "Intensify" Adjectives  
Multiplicatively in Three Samples

<u>Adverb</u>	<u>Wayne</u>	<u>Princeton</u>	<u>Dartmouth</u>
(Unmodified)	1.000	1.000	1.000
Slightly	.555	.538	.559
Somewhat	.685	.662	.719
Rather	.846	.843	.887
Pretty	.935	.878	.961
Quite	1.042	1.047	1.109
Decidedly	1.216	1.165	1.231
Unusually	1.291	1.281	1.324
Very	1.317	1.254	1.323
Extremely	1.593	1.446	1.546
N	218	186	133

(From Cliff, 1959, p. 38-39)

Table 3

## Means and Standard Deviations of Expressions of Frequency

<u>Expressions of Frequency</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>
Always	58.01	3.524
Continually	50.16	3.177
Constantly	49.70	3.311
Frequently if not always	45.24	3.062
Very often	42.45	3.076
A great deal of the time	41.37	3.083
Very frequently	40.02	3.327
A great many times	39.28	3.090
Usually	39.18	3.333
Often	37.64	3.090
Frequently	36.07	3.289
Quite often	35.39	3.930
Rather frequently	34.44	3.177
Commonly	32.97	3.140
Fairly often	32.64	3.303
Fairly many times	30.65	3.000
Sometimes	19.42	2.864
Some of the time	18.01	3.013
To some degree	15.52	2.918
Now and then	15.19	3.040
Occasionally	14.92	3.062
Once in a while	10.22	2.890
Not often	7.78	2.553
Not very often	7.23	2.559
Fairly infrequently	6.99	2.722
Infrequently	6.47	2.606
Rather seldom	6.42	2.660
Very seldom	4.72	2.642
Rarely	4.56	2.234
Very infrequently	4.54	2.472
Seldom if ever	3.69	2.421
Hardly at all	3.47	2.383
Hardly ever	3.34	2.234
Very rarely	2.99	2.109
Almost never	2.63	2.104
Seldom	.33	2.600
None of the time	.17	1.485
Not at all	.15	1.525
Never	.08	1.411

Table 4

## Means and Standard Deviations of Expressions of Quantity

<u>Expressions of Quantity</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>
All	66.12	4.315
An exhaustive amount of	59.27	4.710
Almost entirely	57.61	5.755
Completely	57.35	5.900
An extraordinary amount of	54.46	4.375
Almost completely	51.38	4.710
An extremely abundant amount of	48.89	4.519
An extreme amount of	48.20	3.589
A great amount of	41.56	2.741
A great deal of	41.36	2.825
Very much	40.59	2.938
A full amount of	40.50	3.785
A lot of	37.10	2.774
Much	35.14	2.636
Quite a bit of	34.24	2.708
A good bit of	32.65	3.133
A considerable amount of	31.44	2.904
Pretty much	30.04	2.870
Fairly much	27.70	2.423
An ample amount of	26.22	2.812
An adequate amount of	24.07	2.600
A moderate amount of	21.80	3.420
Some	18.63	2.918
To some extent	13.42	2.945
To some degree	13.10	2.717
Somewhat	11.75	3.034
A limited amount of	9.57	2.851
A little	7.81	2.495
A small amount of	7.51	2.524
Comparatively little	7.22	2.710
A little bit of	7.20	2.673
Not much	7.02	2.698
A small degree of	5.27	2.501
Very little	5.21	2.449
A slight amount of	5.09	2.583
A meager amount of	4.28	2.660
A scanty amount of	3.68	2.410
A minimum amount of	3.64	2.707
A trifling amount of	3.13	2.594
Scarcely any	2.98	2.198
A trivial amount of	2.85	2.600
An insignificant amount of	2.48	2.108
Hardly any	2.28	2.204
None	.15	1.653

Table 5

Statistically Optimal Scales of Frequency  
and Percentage Overlap between Scale Points

		Number of Points in Scale				
		Nine	Eight	Seven	Six	Five
						Four
8	Always	24%	7 Always	6 Always	5 Always	4 Always
			24%	24%	5%	2%
7	Continually	21%	6 Continually	5 Constantly	4 Frequently, if not always	3 Very often
			21%	4%	8%	12%
6	Very often	24%	5 Very often	4 Often	3 Quite often	2 Fairly many times
			13%	25%	1%	<1%
5	Quite often	42%	4 Rather frequently	3 Fairly many times	2 Sometimes	1 Occasionally
			2.5%	6%	10%	<1%
4	Fairly many times	6%	3 Sometimes	2 Sometimes	1 Once in a while	0 Never
			45%	10%	2%	
3	Sometimes		2 Now and then	1 Once in a while	0 Never	
			16%	2%		
2	Occasionally		1 Not often	0 Never		
			7%			
1	Not very often		0 Never			
0	Never					

18

\*Represents the percentage overlap in distributions between its own scale point and the scale point directly below it. Thus, there is 24% overlap in response distributions between response at point 7 and response at point 8 in the nine-point scale.

Table 6

Statistically Optimal Scales of Quantity  
and Percentage Overlap between Scale Points

		Number of Points in Scale				
		Nine	Eight	Seven	Six	Five
						Four
8 All	44%*	7 All	39%	6 All	10%	4 All
7 An exhaustive amount of 18%		6 Almost entirely 31%		5 An extraordinary amount of 7%		3 All
6 An extreme amount of 29%		5 An extreme amount of 8%		4 Almost completely 16%		2 A great amount of <1%
5 A great deal of 20%		4 A lot of 7%		3 Very much 2%		1 A moderate amount of <1%
4 Quite a bit of 5%		3 Fairly much 9%		2 Fairly much <1%		0 None
3 An adequate amount of 32%		2 Some 9%		1 To some degree <1%		
2 Some 5%		1 A limited amount of 4%		0 None		
1 A little 6%		0 None				
0 None						

19

\*Represents the percentage overlap in distributions between its own scale point and the scale point directly below it. Thus, there is 44% overlap in response distributions between response at point 7 and response at point 8.



Distribution ListNAVY

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 4 Dr. Marshall J. Farr<br>Director, Personnel and Training<br>Research Programs<br>Office of Naval Research<br>Arlington, VA 22217                | 1 Chief of Naval Technical Training<br>Naval Air Station Memphis (75)<br>Millington, TN 38054<br>ATTN: Dr. G.D. Mayo        |
| 1 Director<br>ONR Branch Office<br>495 Summer Street<br>Boston, MA 02210  | 1 Chief of Naval Training<br>Naval Air Station<br>Pensacola, FL 32508<br>ATTN: CAPT Allen E. McMichael                      |
| 1 Director<br>ONR Branch Office<br>1030 East Green Street<br>Pasadena, CA 91101   | 1 Chief<br>Bureau of Medicine and Surgery<br>Code 513<br>Washington, DC 20390   |
| 1 Director<br>ONR Branch Office<br>536 South Clark Street<br>Chicago, IL 60605  | 1 Chief<br>Bureau of Medicine and Surgery<br>Research Division (Code 713)<br>Department of the Navy<br>Washington, DC 20390 |
| 1 Office of Naval Research<br>Area Office<br>207 West 24th Street<br>New York, NY 10011   | 1 Commandant of the Marine Corps<br>(Code A01M)<br>Washington, DC 20380   |
| 1 Commander<br>Operational Test and Evaluation<br>Force<br>U.S. Naval Base<br>Norfolk, VA 23511   | 1 Commander Naval Air Reserve<br>Naval Air Station<br>Glenview, IL 60026  |
| 6 Director<br>Naval Research Laboratory<br>Code 2627<br>Washington, DC 20390  | 1 Commander<br>Naval Air Systems Command<br>Navy Department, AIR-413C<br>Washington, DC 20360                               |
| 12 Defense Documentation Center<br>Cameron Station, Building 5<br>5010 Duke Street<br>Alexandria, VA 22314  | 1 Commander<br>Submarine Development Group Two<br>Fleet Post Office<br>New York, NY 09501                                   |
| 1 Chairman<br>Behavioral Science Department<br>Naval Command and Management<br>Division<br>U.S. Naval Academy<br>Luce Hall<br>Annapolis, MD 21402 | 1 Commanding Officer<br>Naval Air Technical Training Center<br>Jacksonville, FL 32213                                       |
|   | 1 Commanding Officer<br>Naval Medical Neuropsychiatric<br>Research Unit<br>San Diego, CA 92152                              |

- 1 Commanding Officer  
Naval Personnel and Training  
Research Laboratory  
San Diego, CA 92152
- 1 Commanding Officer  
Service School Command  
U.S. Naval Training Center  
San Diego, CA 92133  
ATTN: Code 303
- 1 Head, Personnel Measurement Staff  
Capital Area Personnel Service  
Office  
Ballston Tower #2, Room 1204  
801 N. Randolph Street  
Arlington, VA 22203
- 1 Program Coordinator  
Bureau of Medicine and Surgery  
(Code 71G)  
Department of the Navy  
Washington, DC 20390
- 1 Research Director, Code 06  
Research and Evaluation Department  
U.S. Naval Examining Center  
Building 2711 - Green Bay Area  
Great Lakes, IL 60088  
ATTN: C.S. Winiewicz
- 1 Superintendent  
Naval Postgraduate School  
Monterey, CA 93940  
ATTN: Library (Code 2124)
- 1 Technical Director  
Naval Personnel Research and  
Development Laboratory  
Washington Navy Yard  
Building 200  
Washington, DC 20390
- 1 Technical Director  
Personnel Research Division  
Bureau of Naval Personnel  
Washington, DC 20370
- 1 Technical Library (Pers-11B)  
Bureau of Naval Personnel  
Department of the Navy  
Washington, DC 20360
- 1 Technical Library  
Naval Ship Systems Command  
National Center  
Building 3 Room 3  
S-08  
Washington, DC 20360
- 1 Technical Reference Library  
Naval Medical Research Institute  
National Naval Medical Center  
Bethesda, MD 20014
- 1 COL George Caridakis  
Director, Office of Manpower  
Utilization  
Headquarters, Marine Corps (AOIH)  
MCB  
Quantico, VA 22134
- 1 Special Assistant for Research  
and Studies  
OASN (M&RA)  
The Pentagon, Room 4E794  
Washington, DC 20350
- 1 Mr. George N. Graine  
Naval Ship Systems Command  
(SHIPS 03H)  
Department of the Navy  
Washington, DC 20360
- 1 CDR Richard L. Martin, USN  
COMFAIRMIRAMAR F-14  
NAS Miramar, CA 92145
- 1 Mr. Lee Miller (AIR 413E)  
Naval Air Systems Command  
5600 Columbia Pike  
Falls Church, VA 22042
- 1 Dr. James J. Regan  
Code 55  
Naval Training Device Center  
Orlando, FL 32813

1 Dr. A.L. Slafkosky  
Scientific Advisor (Code Ax)  
Commandant of the Marine Corps  
Washington, DC 20380

1 LCDR Charles J. Theisen, Jr.,  
MSC, USN  
CSOT  
Naval Air Development Center  
Warminster, PA 18974

1 Dr. Harold Booher  
NAVAIR 415C  
Naval Air Systems Command  
5600 Columbia Pike  
Falls Church, VA 22042

#### ARMY

1 Behavioral Sciences Division  
Office of Chief of Research and  
Development  
Department of the Army  
Washington, DC 20310

1 U.S. Army Behavior and Systems  
Research Laboratory  
Rosslyn Commonwealth Building,  
Room 239  
1300 Wilson Boulevard  
Arlington, VA 22209

1 Director of Research  
U.S. Army Armor Human Research  
Unit  
ATTN: Library  
Building 2422 Morade Street  
Fort Knox, KY 40121

1 COMMANDANT  
U.S. Army Adjutant General  
School  
Fort Benjamin Harrison, IN 46216  
ATTN: ATSAG-EA

1 Commanding Officer  
ATTN: LTC Montgomery  
USACDC-PASA  
Ft. Benjamin Harrison, IN 46249

1 Director  
Behavioral Sciences Laboratory  
U.S. Army Research Institute of  
Environmental Medicine  
Natick, MA 01760

1 Commandant  
United States Army Infantry School  
ATTN: ATSIN-H  
Fort Benning, GA 319-5

1 U.S. Army Research Institute  
Room 239  
Commonwealth Building  
1300 Wilson Boulevard  
Arlington, VA 22209  
ATTN: Dr. R. Dusek

1 Mr. Edmund Fuchs  
BESRL  
Commonwealth Building, Room 239  
1320 Wilson Boulevard  
Arlington, VA 22209

#### AIR FORCE

1 AFHRL (TR/Dr. G.A. Eckstrand)  
Wright-Patterson Air Force Base  
Ohio 45433

1 AFHRL/MD  
701 Prince Street  
Room 200  
Alexandria, VA 22314

1 AFOSR (HR)  
1400 Wilson Boulevard  
Arlington, VA 22209

1 COMMANDANT  
USAF School of Aerospace Medicine  
ATTN: Aeromedical Library (SCL-4)  
Brooks AFB, TX 78235

1 Personnel Research Division  
AFHRL  
Lackland Air Force Base  
San Antonio, TX 78236

- 1 Headquarters, U.S. Air Force  
Chief, Personnel Research and  
Analysis Division (AF/DPXY)  
Washington, DC 20330
- 1 Research and Analysis Division  
AF/DPXYR Room 4C200  
Washington, DC 20330
- 1 CAPT Jack Thorpe USAF  
Dept. of Psychology  
Bowling Green State University  
Bowling Green, OH 43403

DOD

- 1 Mr. Joseph J. Cowan, Chief  
Psychological Research Branch (P-1)  
U.S. Coast Guard Headquarters  
400 Seventh Street, SW  
Washington, DC 20590
- 1 Dr. Ralph R. Canter  
Director for Manpower Research  
Office of Secretary of Defense  
The Pentagon, Room 3C980  
Washington, DC 20301
- 1 Dr. Charles Ullman  
Chief of Counseling, Training  
Programs  
OSD(M&RA)  
The Pentagon, Room 2C252  
Washington, DC 20301

OTHER GOVERNMENT

- 1 Dr. Alvin E. Goins, Chief  
Personality and Cognition  
Research Section  
Behavioral Sciences Research  
Branch  
National Institute of Mental Health  
5600 Fishers Lane  
Rockville, MD 20852

- 1 Dr. Lorraine D. Eyde  
Bureau of Intergovernmental  
Personnel Programs  
Room 2519  
U.S. Civil Service Commission  
1900 E. Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20415

- 1 Professor John Annett  
The Open University  
Waltontale, BLETCHLEY  
Bucks, ENGLAND

- 1 Dr. Richard C. Atkinson  
Department of Psychology  
Stanford University  
Stanford, CA 94305

- 1 Dr. Kenneth E. Clark  
University of Rochester  
College of Arts and Sciences  
River Campus Station  
Rochester, NY 14627

- 1 Dr. Rene V. Davis  
Department of Psychology  
324 Elliott Hall  
University of Minnesota  
Minneapolis, MN 55455

- 1 Dr. Robert Dubin  
Graduate School of Administration  
University of California  
Irvine, CA 92664

- 1 Dr. Marvin D. Dunnette  
University of Minnesota  
Department of Psychology  
Elliott Hall  
Minneapolis, MN 55455

- 1 ERIC  
Processing and Reference Facility  
4833 Rugby Avenue  
Bethesda, MD 20014

- 1 Dr. Victor Fields  
Department of Psychology  
Montgomery College  
Rockville, MD 20850

- 1 Mr. Paul P. Foley  
Naval Personnel Research and  
Development Laboratory  
Washington Navy Yard  
Washington, DC 20390
- 1 Dr. Robert Glaser  
Learning Research and  
Development Center  
University of Pittsburgh  
Pittsburgh, PA 15213
- 1 Dr. Albert S. Glickman  
American Institutes for Research  
8555 Sixteenth Street  
Silver Spring, MD 20910
- 1 Dr. Richard S. Hatch  
Decision Systems Associates, Inc.  
11428 Rockville Pike  
Rockville, MD 20852
- 1 Dr. M.D. Havron  
Human Sciences Research, Inc.  
Westgate Industrial Park  
7710 Old Springhouse Road  
McLean, VA 22101
- 1 Human Resources Research  
Organization  
Division #3  
Post Office Box 5787  
Presidio of Monterey, CA 93940
- 1 Human Resources Research  
Organization  
Division #4, Infantry  
Post Office Box 2086  
Fort Benning, GA 31905
- 1 Human Resources Research  
Organization  
Division #5, Air Defense  
Post Office Box 6057  
Fort Bliss, TX 79916
- 1 Library  
HumRRO Division Number 6  
P.O. Box 428  
Fort Rucker, AL 36360
- 1 Dr. Lawrence B. Johnson  
Lawrence Johnson and Associates, Inc.  
2001 "S" Street, NW  
Suite 502  
Washington, DC 20009
- 1 Dr. Norman J. Johnson  
Associate Professor of Social Policy  
School of Urban and Public Affairs  
Carnegie-Mellon University  
Pittsburgh, PA 15213
- 1 Dr. Roger A. Kaufman  
Graduate School of Human Behavior  
U.S. International University  
8655 E. Pomerada Road  
San Diego, California 92124
- 1 Dr. Frederick M. Lord  
Educational Testing Service  
Princeton, NJ 08540
- 1 Dr. E.J. McCormick  
Department of Psychological Sciences  
Purdue University  
Lafayette, IN 47907
- 1 Dr. Robert R. Mackie  
Human Factors Research, Inc.  
Santa Barbara Research Park  
6780 Cortona Drive  
Goleta, CA 93017
- 1 Dr. Stanley M. Nealy  
Department of Psychology  
Colorado State University  
Fort Collins, CO 80521
- 1 Mr. Luigi Petrullo  
2431 North Edgewood Street  
Arlington, VA 22207
- 1 Dr. Robert D. Pritchard  
Assistant Professor of Psychology  
Purdue University  
Lafayette, IN 47907
- 1 Psychological Abstracts  
American Psychological Association  
1200 Seventeenth Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20036

- 1 Dr. Diane M. Ramsey-Klee  
R-K Research & System Design  
3947 Ridgemont Drive  
Malibu, CA 90265
- 1 Dr. Joseph W. Rigney  
Behavioral Technology  
Laboratories  
University of Southern  
California  
3717 South Grand  
Los Angeles, CA 90007
- 1 Dr. Leonard L. Rosenbaum, Chairman  
Department of Psychology  
Montgomery College  
Rockville, MD 20850
- 1 Dr. George E. Rowland  
Rowland and Company, Inc.  
Post Office Box 61  
Haddonfield, NJ 08033
- 1 Dr. Benjamin Schneider  
Department of Psycholgy  
University of Maryland  
College Park, MD 20742
- 1 Dr. Arthur I. Siegel  
Applied Psychological Services  
Science Center  
404 East Lancaster Avenue  
Wayne, PA 19087
- 1 Dr. David Weiss  
University of Minnesota  
Department of Psychology  
Elliott Hall  
Minneapolis, MN 55455
- 1 Mr. Edmond Marks  
109 Grange Building  
Pennsylvania State University  
University Park, PA 16802
- 1 LCOL Austin W. Kibler, Director  
Human Resources Research Office  
ARPA  
1400 Wilson Boulevard  
Arlington, VA 22209
- 1 Century Research Corporation  
4113 Lee Highway  
Arlington, VA 22207
- 1 CAPT John F. Riley, USN  
Commanding Officer  
U.S. Naval Amphibious School  
Coronado, CA 92155
- 1 Dr. Kenneth E. Young, Vice President  
American College Testing Program  
Suite 340  
One DuPont Circle, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20036
- 1 Mr. Emanuel P. Somer, Head  
Motivational and Survey Research  
Division  
Psychological Research Department  
Naval Personnel R&D Laboratory  
Washington Navy Yard  
Washington, DC 20374